



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/709,383	11/13/2000	Paul Jackson	37965-0006	5085

26633 7590 11/01/2002

HELLER EHRMAN WHITE & MCAULIFFE LLP
1666 K STREET,NW
SUITE 300
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER

TRAVERS, RUSSELL S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1617

DATE MAILED: 11/01/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/709,383

Applicant(s)
Jackson et al

Examiner
Russell Travers

Art Unit
1617



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Aug 2, 2002
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) 1-20, 23, and 28-30 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 21, 22, and 24-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit:

The amendment filed August 2, 2002 has been received and entered into the file.

Applicant's arguments filed August 2, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

Claims 1-30 are presented for examination.

Applicant's election with traverse of group XXVIII (claims 21, 22 and 24-27) in Paper No. 11 is acknowledged. The traversal is on unstated ground(s). This is not found persuasive because successful traversal must be supported by effective fact based rebuttal arguments .

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claims 1-20, 23 and 28-30 are withdrawn from consideration.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The specification is objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to adequately teach how to make and/or use the invention, and thereby failing to provide an enabling disclosure.

Art Unit:

The instant specification fails to provide information that would allow the skilled artisan to practice the instant invention without undue experimentation. Attention is directed to *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (CAFC 1988) at 1404 where the court set forth the eight factors to consider when assessing if a disclosure would have required undue experimentation. Citing *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546 (BdApls 1986) at 547 the court recited eight factors:

- 1) the quantity of experimentation necessary,
- 2) the amount of direction or guidance provided,
- 3) the presence of absence of working examples,
- 4) the nature of the invention,
- 5) the state of the prior art,
- 6) the relative skill of those in the art
- 7) the predictability of the art, and
- 8) the breadth of the claims.

Applicant fails to set forth the criteria that defines neither inhibitors of " dipeptidyl peptidase IV". Additionally, Applicant fails to provide information allowing the skilled artisan to ascertain these compounds without undue experimentation. In the instant case, only a limited number of " dipeptidyl peptidase IV" examples are set forth, thereby failing to provide sufficient working examples. It is noted that these examples are neither exhaustive, nor define the class of compounds required. The

Art Unit:

pharmaceutical art is unpredictable, requiring each embodiment to be individually assessed for physiological activity. The instant claims read on all " dipeptidyl peptidase IV", necessitating an exhaustive search for the embodiments suitable to practice the claimed invention. Applicants fail to provide information sufficient to practice the claimed invention, absent undue experimentation.

Claims 21 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for the reasons set forth in the objection to the specification.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 21 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ronai et al.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made

Art Unit:

to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Claims 21-22 and 24-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Ronai et al.

Ronai et al teach the claimed compounds as old and well known in combination with various pharmaceutical carriers and excipients in a dosage form. These medicaments are taught as useful for treating CNS pain, viewed by the skilled artisan as a CNS disorder. Claims 22 and 25-27, and the primary reference, differ as to:

- 1) employment of these medicaments for various therapeutic uses, and
- 2) administration dosage of the medicaments.
- 3) specific properties herein recited.

The skilled artisan would have seen the application of analgesics for the treatment of migraine as obvious to those of normal skill in the art. Additionally, the skilled artisan would have seen treating pain collateral to any disease with the claimed analgesic compounds as obvious to the skilled artisan, absent contraindications.

Thus, possessing the Examiner cited teachings, the skilled artisan would have been

Art Unit:

motivated to employ the claimed compounds for the use herein claimed, and enjoy a reasonable expectation of therapeutic success

Determining the active ingredient dosage level required to effect optimal therapeutic benefit is well within the Skilled Artisan's purview and the benefits of achieving such maximization obvious, to said skilled artisan. The claims merely recite the obvious employment of old and well known active ingredients, carriers and excipients. Thus, the only issue presented in the instant application is the obviousness of the claimed analgesic methods.

The instant claims are directed to effecting a biochemical pathway with an old and well known compound. Arguments that Applicant's claims are not directed to the old and well known ultimate utility for this compound are not probative. It is well settled patent law that mode of action elucidation fails to impart patentable moment to otherwise old and obvious subject matter. Applicant's attention is directed to In re Swinehart, (169 USPQ 226 at 229) where the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals stated "is elementary that the mere recitation of a newly discovered function or property, inherently possessed by things in the prior art, does not cause a claim drawn to those things to distinguish over the prior art.". Additionally, where the Patent Office has reason to believe that a functional limitation asserted to be critical for establishing novelty in the claimed subject matter, may in fact be an inherent characteristic of the prior art, it possesses the authority to requires the applicant to prove that the subject

Art Unit:

matter shown to be in the prior art does not possess the characteristic relied on. In the instant invention, the claims are directed to the ultimate utility set forth in the prior art, albeit distanced by various biochemical intermediates. The ultimate utility for the claimed compounds is old and well known, rendering the claimed subject matter obvious to the skilled artisan. It would follow therefore that the instant claims are properly rejected under 35 USC 103.

Examiner was unable to obtain those references cited in the parent case.

RESPONSE TO ARGUMENTS

Attention is directed to *General Electric Company v. Wabash Appliance Corporation et al* 37 USPQ 466 (US 1938), at 469, speaking to functional language at the point of novelty as herein employed: "the vice of a functional claim exists not only when a claim is "wholly" functional, if that is ever true, but when the inventor is painstaking when he recites what has already been seen, and then uses conveniently functional language at the exact point of novelty". Functional language at the point of novelty, as herein employed by Applicants, is further admonished in *University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co.* 43 USPQ2d 1398 (CAFC 1997) at 1406: stating this usage does "little more than outlin[e] goals appellants hope the recited invention achieves and the problems the invention will hopefully ameliorate". Applicants functional language at the point of novelty fails to meet the requirements set forth under 35 USC 112, first

Art Unit:

paragraph. Claims employing functional language at the point of novelty, such as Applicants', neither provide those elements required to practice the inventions, nor "inform the public during the life of the patent of the limits of the monopoly asserted" *General Electric Company v. Wabash Appliance Corporation et supra*, at 468. Claims thus constructed provide no guidance as to medicaments employed, levels for providing therapeutic benefit, or provide notice for those practicing in the art, limits of protection. Simply stated, the presented claims are an invitation to experiment, not reciting a specific medicament regimen useful for practicing the instant invention.

With regard to guidance provided, or required, if the routeineer must test every compound to ascertain the suitability for use in the instant invention, the burden of undue experimentation has been placed on the Examiner. In the instant case, each compounds suitability for employment in the instant invention, save those few exemplified in the specification, must be accessed, de novo, before the invention is practiced. Thus, the routeineer is burdened with undue experimentation to practice the claimed invention.

Arguments provided to rebut the instant anticipation rejection are unconvincing. Attention is directed to Ronai et al teaching administration of the claimed compound, a reversible dipeptidial aninopeptidase IV inhibitor (diprotin a) administered intracerebroventricularly providing CNS analgesic activity as recited in the rejected claims. Examiner notes the full text Ronai et al article is not of record, thus, rebuttal

Art Unit:

arguments specifically based on the full text are moot. Examiner would be happy to entertain such arguments when the full text article was made of record.


To treat a malady, the skilled artisan must simply treat those symptomologies associated with the specified syndromes. As stated in paper 12, those compounds recited in the instant claims are old and well known for providing analgesia, thus, providing therapeutic benefit for the maladies herein claimed. In the instant case, Examiner need not reach this therapeutic goal. Attention is directed to the Ronai et al administration method" intracerebroventricularly", indicating the effect for the analgesic activity as CNS, not peripheral, as averred by the presented rebuttal arguments. Ronai et al teaching the claimed compounds as possessing CNS analgesic activity, would have motivated the skilled artisan to employ this compound therapeutically for migraine, or analgesia for tumors, stroke, or pain collateral to various other maladies herein claimed. Possessing these teachings, the skilled artisan would have seen the employment of these compounds for those analgesic therapeutic uses herein claimed as obvious, to those of normal skill in the art.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a). The practice of automatically extending the shortened statutory period an additional month upon the filing of a timely first response to a final rejection has been discontinued by the Office. See 1021 TMOG 35.

Art Unit:

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Russell Travers at telephone number (703) 308-4603.



Russell Travers
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1617